DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 065 028 HE 003 154

TITLE 1971 Annual Report of the Director.
INSTITUTION California State Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Sacramento.
PUB DATE [72]
NOTE 58p.; Council Report 72-1

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; *Educational Coordination; *Educational Development; Educational Facilities; Educational Planning; Federal Aid; *Higher Education; *Program Coordination; *Statewide Planning

ABSTRACT

This document presents the third annual summary of the activities of the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education. The summary includes activities related to: (1) Coordination and governance in higher education; (2) coordinating academic plans and programs; (3) educational opportunity programs; (4) planning for educational facilities; (5) faculty affairs; (6) federal programs for higher education; (7) legislative affairs; (8) council affairs; (9) council reports and studies issued during 1971; and (10) council resolutions adopted during 1971. (HS)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

1971

ANNUAL REPORT

OF THE

DIRECTOR

COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Council Report 72-1

2

PREFACE

This is the third annual summary of the activities of the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education and as in the past, the staff is surprised at the amount of ground covered by our agency in the space of a calendar year.

We hope that the members of the Council, our colleagues in State government, and those in other states who work in the field of state-wide planning of higher education will find this synopsis useful.

Owen Albert Knorr
Director

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COORDINATION AND GOVERNANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION. 1

A Master Plan for the 1970's 1
The Chartering of Private Institutions 2
Delineation of Functions 3

COORDINATING ACADEMIC PLANS AND PROGRAMS 5

The Role of the Coordinating Council 5
Coordination in Criminal Justice and Agriculture 6
Higher Cost Programs 7
Efficiency in Graduate Education 9
Early Childhood Education. 10
Teacher Preparation and Licensing. 11
The Development of the External Degree 11

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS 13

PLANNING FOR EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES. 15

The Need for New Campuses. 15
The Utilization of Educational Facilities. 15
The Sharing of Educational Facilities. 18

FACULTY AFFAIRS. 21

Faculty Salaries and Benefits. 21
Academic Freedom and Faculty Responsibility. 23

FEDERAL PROGRAMS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION. 25

Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965. 25
Title I, Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 26
Title VI-A, Higher Education Act of 1965 27
Title VIII, Housing Act of 1963. 27
Comprehensive Facilities Planning Grants 28
Special Opportunity Planning Grants. 29

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS. 31

COUNCIL AFFAIRS. 37

Composition of the Council 37
Council Membership 37
Council Budget 38

COUNCIL STAFF. 41

COUNCIL REPORTS AND STUDIES ISSUED DURING 1971 45

COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED DURING 1971. 47

ADVISORY COMMITTEES 51

COORDINATION AND GOVERNANCE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

A Master Plan for the 1970's

At its first meeting of the year, in January, the Coordinating Council announced that it would "create a broadly representative, select committee" to examine the assumptions, philosophical bases, and recommendations of the 1970 Master Plan "in light of new circumstances and developments and the needs of the 1970's."

In taking this action, the Council stated that the 1960 Master Plan "has had a positive and creative impact on California's higher education and has been beneficial to the State and a model to the nation." However, the Council continued, "changing social attitudes and conditions call into question some of our present approaches to higher education." The Council also recognized that "the people of California are gravely concerned with cost and results of all higher education."

This action was entirely appropriate. The Council's position on its relationship to the Master Plan was expressed clearly in the minutes of one of its first meetings: "The Coordinating Council is the mechanism for the review, interpretation, application, and modification of the Master Plan agreements and recommendations."

The Council requested its staff to bring to the following meeting recommendations on the organization and composition of the Select Committee and a plan of action for the conduct of its business.

On May 10, the Director of the Council announced the appointment of a seventeen-member Select Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education. The membership combines the talents and experience of civic, financial, educational, and business leaders from throughout California.

Beginning with its initial meeting in June, the Select Committee has met monthly, except in August. Dr. Joseph B. Platt, President of Harvey Mudd College, Claremont, is Chairman of the Select Committee and Mr. Richard Hernandez is Vice Chairman. Dr. Durward Long, on leave from his position as Vice Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin Center System, is the Executive Director and an Associate Director of the Council.

In fulfilling its charge "to examine the policies and issues of the Master Plan of 1960 in light of new circumstances, developments, and the needs of higher education in the 1970's," the Select Committee is giving priority to issues identified previously by the Council, those specified in Assembly Concurrent Resolution 166, and many of those presently under consideration by the Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan.

Areas currently under study are: (1) Cost/Benefit and Finance, (2) Student Needs, Aspirations, and Interests, and (3) Foregone Opportunities. The results of this work will be incorporated into later studies of broader areas such as Administration, Governance, Coordination, and Planning.

Liaison has been established with the four segments of public and private higher education, with the Legislature's Joint Committee on the Master Plan, and with other appropriate State offices. The Select Committee has consulted with and heard testimony from the chief administrators of public and private higher education and from officials in State government. In addition, consultations have been held with students from high schools, colleges, and universities.

The Select Committee has made substantial progress in fulfilling its charge from the Council. Reports on its work are presented at each Council meeting, with a final report scheduled to be completed by October 1972.

The Chartering of Private Institutions

In California, the establishment and operation of private educational institutions beyond the high school level is governed by Division 21 of the Education Code. At the present time there are more than one thousand Division 21 schools and colleges in the State. They range from recognized and well-established senior institutions, such as the University of Southern California and California Institute of Technology, to reputable business and vocational schools to some institutions of very questionable quality.

At the direction of the Legislature (Senate Concurrent Resolution 148) the Coordinating Council undertook a thorough examination of Division 21, working in cooperation with the State Department of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, those responsible for its administration.

Council staff gave its attention to the overall operation of Division 21 and to the requirements it sets out for the establishment of new private institutions and for the development of their courses of study and academic programs. The staff also studied the implications of pending legislation to revise Division 21.

The staff reported its findings in a position paper presented to the Council at its October meeting. The staff advised that "while Division 21 . . . carries out the legislative intent to encourage private postsecondary education in California, the conditions under which nonpublic, postsecondary institutions can come into

existence do not satisfactorily provide the safeguards needed to assure a quality educational enterprise and do not adequately provide protection to the citizen consumers of higher education . . ." In its report, the staff cited numerous "horrible examples" from the files of the Attorney General to support this conclusion.

The staff also advised the currently pending legislation would not appreciably change the "conditions" cited above, and should not be passed. Rather, the staff recommended, the Council should be called upon by the Legislature to draft changes in Division 21, with the cooperation and assistance of the Attorney General and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. The staff concluded that the draft of these changes should be submitted to the Senate and Assembly Education Committees as the basis for new legislation.

The Council adopted the recommendations of its staff. Since then, the Director and members of his staff have held discussions with individual members of the Legislature and other appropriate State officials with the view of implementing the recommended changes in Division 21.

Delineation of Functions

The Donahoe Higher Education Act of 1960 delineates the functions that are to be carried out by each segment of California higher education. The Coordinating Council is responsible for advising the Governor and the Legislature at the beginning of each year of any changes in these functions that it feels are necessary or desirable.

At its January 1971 meeting, the Council determined that no changes were presently needed in the delineation of functions. However, the Council advised the Governor and the Legislature that it intended to conduct a study of the 1960 Master Plan and that recommendations for changes in the functions and programs of the segments might well ensue.

COORDINATING ACADEMIC PLANS AND PROGRAMS

The Role of the Coordinating Council

Coordination of California's educational resources, if it is to be effective, requires that the planning of academic programs in each segment of public higher education be carried out within a statewide context. Unnecessary duplication of programs within or among segments dissipates limited and badly needed funds; it can also dilute educational quality. Conversely, the failure to meet legitimate needs can also occur in the absence of planning.

Recognizing that planning "cannot take place after the fact," the Council in 1969 requested the Director and his staff, in cooperation with representatives of the three public segments, "to formulate a plan for review of new programs which will provide for the orderly growth of public higher education in California and involve the Council as early as possible in program planning."

An extended series of meetings and discussions between members of the Council's staff and representatives from each of the three segments of public higher education followed. As reported later by Council staff, a primary concern during these negotiations was to balance the Council's appropriate concern that "the academic plans and programs of the public segments reflect the broad interests of the State" with "the legitimate aspirations of the segments for excellence and individuality within their respective functions."

The joint efforts culminated in a document entitled "The Council's Roles in the Review of Academic Plans and Programs," which was adopted by the Council at its March 1971 meeting.

As set forth in the document, the "broad interests of the State," as they relate to academic plans and programs in public higher education, suggest:

1. Programs necessary to the higher education of all eligible resident students;

2. Public service programs;

3. Programs and activities that advance the boundaries of knowledge;

4. Programs that reflect the special social, geographic, and economic characteristics of California; and

5. Prudent use of public funds.

In addition to defining the roles of the segments and the Council in planning, establishing review procedures, and outlining staff relationships, the document defines "Core Programs." These are "academic programs at each University campus or State College or Community College which segmental and Council staff agree in advance do not require review by the Council prior to establishment."

The document specifies that a list of core programs by level of degree, except for the doctorate, shall be maintained in the Office of the Director. Mutually satisfactory lists of core programs have been developed by the University and the State Colleges, and are now on file. As soon as a suitable taxonomy can be developed, a list of core programs in the Community Colleges will be submitted.

Coordination in Criminal Justice and Agriculture

Some eighteen months ago, the Council authorized the Director to initiate special studies of several academic subject areas in which statewide coordination of programs appeared to be justified. The Director was also authorized to retain consultants, who were recognized authorities in their respective specialized fields, to conduct these studies.

Law enforcement and corrections was selected as the first subject area for study. The consultant was Richard A. Myren, Professor and Dean of the School of Criminal Justice at the State University of New York, Albany.

Education in Criminal Justice, which Dean Myren presented to the Council at its September 1970 meeting, aroused widespread interest among law enforcement organizations throughout the State. It also generated criticism from these groups concerning recommendations on Community College programs, namely: (1) the number of Community College credits in the major acceptable for transfer to a senior institution, (2) responsiveness of programs to local needs, and (3) use of part-time instructors.

The Council deferred action on the report to provide these organizations an opportunity to discuss their objections with Council staff and to submit written comments to the Council.

At the Council's March 1971 meeting, the staff presented a series of recommendations based on Dean Myren's report and reflecting, where appropriate, the views of others concerned with law enforcement training. The recommendations were adopted by the Council.

Among these was a recommendation calling for the establishment of a Liaison Committee on Criminal Justice that would address itself to the problem of transfer of credit from two- to four-year institutions.

A recommendation that programs be oriented toward the criminal justice system rather than the individual agency (corrections, police, etc.) has received considerable national attention. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEEP) has advised that its institutional grants will be awarded to those applicants who are making this transition in their educational and training emphasis.

The staff also recommended that the University of California, Berkeley, be recognized as the major research source for criminal justice in

California and that the University and the State Colleges consider joint doctoral programs as the latter expand and improve their programs in criminal justice.

Agriculture was the second subject area selected for special study. The consultant for this study was George A. Gries, Dean of the College of Arts and Science at Oklahoma State University. His report, Agricultural Programs in California Public Higher Education, was presented to the Council at its October meeting this year. In addition to examining agricultural programs in each segment of public higher education, Dr. Gries addressed himself to the cost of instruction and the problems encountered in the area of program articulation and student transfer. Council staff comments and recommendations based on the report will be presented to the Council for action at a future meeting.

Higher Cost Programs

During its 1969 Session, the Legislature directed the Coordinating Council "to undertake a study of.....highly expensive, specialized, limited-use academic programs and facilities" in the University, the State Colleges, and the Community Colleges. The legislative intent of House Resolution 376 is to concentrate "such programs and facilities at strategic locations in these state educational systems and thereby" effect a "reduction in total state expense" for their support. The resolution called for a preliminary report to be submitted at the beginning of the 1970 Session and a final report at the beginning of the 1971 Session.

The preliminary report identified those program components contributing to higher-cost programs, primarily capital outlay, support, and teaching costs. A basic finding of Council staff was that unit teaching costs are, in most instances, the predominant element of program costs. The staff also found that no specific subject areas, with the exception of medicine and dentistry, can be identified as inherently high cost. A particular subject area may necessitate high facility costs (e.g., music, drama, agriculture, and certain technologies) or high unit support costs (e.g., chemistry); however, its unit teaching costs may be considerably less than those of other areas (e.g., less than the units costs of library science, journalism, and languages).

The final report of the staff, Higher Cost Programs in California Public Higher Education, was submitted to the Council at its March 1971 meeting.

Again the staff identified unit teaching costs as the predominant element of program costs, and cited examples in which unit teaching costs exceeded unit facility costs by ratios as high as 231/1. A principal factor leading to high unit teaching costs is small class size. Small class sizes may result from instructional practices

within an institution; however, they also develop from having too many programs for a relatively small student demand.

The staff reported that class size data for the fall of 1969 indicated that significant variations in class size existed within the same subject field among segments and among campuses. The availability of facilities apparently did not impose constraints on the distribution of class sizes in any of the segments. The report summarized the distribution of class sizes as follows:

> Approximately one-fifth of the classes in the Community Colleges, one-fourth of the undergraduate classes in the State Colleges, and one-third of the undergraduate classes in the University had enrollments of 14 or fewer students.
>
> At the graduate level, approximately two-thirds of the State College classes and three-fourths of the University classes had enrollments of 14 or fewer students. One-third of the State College and one-half of the University classes enrolled 9 or fewer students.

The report also examined the undergraduate and graduate programs of the State Colleges and the University in terms of productivity. When measured in terms of the number of degrees granted, student credit hours produced, and the number of student majors, certain subject areas were identified in which one or a combination of these factors led to low program activity.

On the basis of these findings and staff recommendations the Council advised the three public segments of higher education to develop policies or guidelines on minimum class size. The policies or guidelines should: (1) establish a minimum class size, by level of instruction; (2) apply to lecture, seminary, and laboratory classes, but not to independent study, research, and thesis classes; and (3) emphasize the need for justifying the continuation of a class below the minimum by the department concerned and approval by the chief academic officer on the campus.

The segments were also advised by the Council to develop policies or guidelines to measure the productivity of academic programs in order to identify those with low activity.

Policies on Minimum Class Size: The policies of the segments on minimum class size were presented to the Council in December as an item of information, together with the comments of its staff. In the opinion of the staff, the upper division class size minimum of eight students at the University was too low, and should be increased to a minimum of ten students, as proposed for the State Colleges by the Board of Trustees. The staff also felt that the graduate class size minimum of four students at the University and five students at the State Colleges should be increased. Pointing out that graduate instruction generally is the most expensive of the three instructional levels in higher education, the staff suggested that a reduction in

the number of small classes would provide a double benefit: more productive use of available faculty and facilities, and encouragement of elimination of low-enrollment graduate programs.

The Board of Governors reported to the Council that guidelines on minimum class size were being developed by individual Community College Districts and would be submitted to the Council in the near future.

Measures of Productivity: Preliminary policies on measures of productivity were submitted by the University and the State Colleges and appeared as an information item on the Council's December agenda. The Chancellor of the State Colleges has established a Task Force on Improving Efficiency in the Use of Resources, which has a subcommittee on Instructional Productivity. The University is developing measures of program activity and productivity, but considerable refinement will be required before the measures can be adopted.

Efficiency in Graduate Education

When the Governor's Task Force on Education turned its attention to California higher education in the fall of 1970, exploratory discussions were held to determine if the Coordinating Council might play a supportive role in examining some aspect of the field that would be useful both to the Task Force and to the Council.

Graduate education was one of the areas that had been selected for study by the Task Force. Since the Council had never studied graduate education per se, but had expressed a desire to do so, this subject was chosen for investigation by Council staff. In making this choice, the Council was aware that graduate education is a sensitive area in which to raise the question of efficiency. However, in the face of declining resources and increasing enrollment pressures, public interest required that it be raised.

Council staff pursued two major objectives in its study of graduate education: (1) to discover ways of increasing its efficiency without increasing the input of State funds, or possible by reducing this input, and (2) to discover ways of maintaining or improving quality when State financial support becomes less readily available.

Information for the report was collected from written questionnaires and personal interviews with selected officials and graduate deans in California institutions and elsewhere. The report however, was not simply a summary of this information, with consequent conclusions and recommendations. Rather, it was a discussion of selected aspects of graduate education, reasoned judgments about the problems encountered, and possible guidelines to solutions.

Six major aspects were selected for discussion: (1) increased efficiency in respect to graduate students, (2) increased efficiency in respect to graduate programs, (3) responsibilities of

faculty for increased efficiency, (4) responsibilities of institutional administration for increased efficiency, (5) responsibilities of State government for increased efficiency, and (6) suggested future actions by the Coordinating Council.

The completed study was presented to the Council for action at its March 1971 meeting. The report recommended 27 guidelines for increasing efficiency in graduate education, which were adopted by the Council. The guidelines dealt with subjects such as selective admissions, reducing the period of time allowed for the completion of graduation requirements, limiting the number of changes in the major, student financial aid, program quality, program review, faculty selection, graduate teaching loads, and restrictions on highly specialized programs.

Recommendations to the Governor and the Legislature called for additional funding for the governing boards to employ staff to oversee graduate programs and the adoption of policies, procedures, and practices in funding graduate education that would maintain and improve quality while increasing efficiency through sound management decisions.

Early Childhood Education

Legislation enacted during the 1969 Session (House Resolution 154 and Senate Bill 982) directed the Coordinating Council to develop an articulation plan among the segments of higher education in regard to programs leading to credentials in early childhood development.

Council staff undertook a study of the programs and the articulation problems involved and presented its report, Early Childhood Development Programs: Articulation and Coordination, at the Council's January 1971 meeting.

As a result of its findings, the staff recommended that the California Community Colleges develop a core curriculum in early childhood development for both vocational and transfer students. To increase student mobility and post professional advancement in the field, the programs should be designed to be acceptable for transfer to both the State Colleges and the University.

The staff also recommended that the University and the State Colleges be encouraged to offer extension and residence courses in early childhood development taught by regular faculty. Additionally, such courses should be offered at times that would make them readily accessible to in-service personnel. Further, the University and State Colleges should be encouraged to study the feasibility of conferring the bachelor's degree in early childhood development on the basis of credit earned either partially or entirely through extension courses. This would provide in-service personnel greater opportunity for professional advancement.

The Council adopted these and other recommendations of the staff as advice to the governing boards of the three public segments.

Conference on Early Childhood Development: Subsequent to the study of programs in early childhood development, the Council and the Liaison Committee on Early Childhood Education of the Articulation Conference sponsored a statewide Conference on Early Childhood Education in Sacramento in March. Some 200 representatives from all segments of higher education, as well as from other agencies, organizations and school districts, were in attendance.

The recommendations of the Council's study were considered at the Conference and were incorporated in the Model Articulation guidelines adopted for use by the State Colleges.

Teacher Preparation and Licensing

During its 1970 Session, the Legislature created the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing. The Commission consists of 15 voting members appointed by the Governor, with ex-officio membership of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and representatives appointed by the Coordinating Council and the three governing boards of public higher education. At its January 1971 meeting, the Council appointed Dr. Crandell of the staff as its ex-officio representative.

The Development of the External Degree

The current widespread interest, both in California and nationally, in "external" or "extended" degree programs raises many issues and suggests certain problems in the area of statewide coordination and planning. The development of such programs, which is now underway at the University of California and the California State Colleges, led the Council in October 1971 to undertake a study of their implications for California higher education.

Of concern is the relationship of these new degree programs to each other, to external degree programs offered by private institutions in California, and to national programs such as "Universities Without Walls," which are being funded by the federal government.

At present, all four of the segments of higher education in California are either planning to establish off-campus learning centers or, in some cases, operating such centers at some distance from the parent campus. Recently, several Community Colleges, the last of the public segments to enter this field, announced the establishment of off-campus centers.

These developments will provide an extension of higher education services to an expanded constituency, potentially adding greater numbers of students to California's already high enrollments. These

developments may also be seen as an alternate mode of higher education for the present group of students. Interpreted either way, they will result in the creation of new programs requiring review by the Council, and the impact of the added services on current and planned facilities will require the close attention of the Council in its consideration of additional centers.

Council staff, in cooperation with the segments of higher education, has initiated the study requested by the Council and expects to issue a preliminary report in the fall of 1972.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS

The Budget Act of 1970 requires that the Coordinating Council "make an evaluation of educational opportunity programs in all segments of public higher education for a report on findings and recommendations to the Governor and Legislature annually."

In directing the Coordinating Council to make such a study, the Legislature and the Governor were aware of the large -- perhaps excessive -- number of investigations, studies, and demands for information that have been made of Educational Opportunity Programs (EOP) during its short history as a statewide effort by various branches of State government and other agencies. This frequent "external" probing into EOP has resulted not only in the presentation of often-conflicting and almost always fragmentary information, but has also required EOP staffs to divert much of their time and efforts to providing widely differing data to satisfy each request.

The first annual evaluation of Educational Opportunity Programs in public higher education was presented to the Council at its March 1971 meeting. In the report, Council staff made two general observations, based on this and earlier studies it had conducted. Since EOP began independently on individual campuses in all the public segments, and since EOP programs must be concerned with student needs at the individual institution, no two programs are the same. However, the staff continued, there are similarities in the types of supporting services provided to EOP students in all three segments: counseling, tutoring, and financial aids. There are also significant similarities in the kinds of data needed from each program to enable the Governor and the Legislature to make funding decisions about EOP on more rational grounds. (Council staff noted that the lack of such data not only delayed the progress of its study, but also prevented the staff from developing measures of program effectiveness.)

On the basis of its findings, Council staff made 19 recommendations concerning Educational Opportunity Programs which were adopted by the Council. The recommendations covered a broad range of topics; in summary, however, they were directed toward providing better service to EOP students through better organization and administration of the program. In the opinion of the staff this overall objective can be achieved through a combination of increased funding for EOP programs and services, through increased communication and the exchange of information between and among students and administrators at all levels, and through efforts by all three public segments to resolve problems of articulation. If EOP is successful, as it now appears to be, the staff concluded, the adequate data gathering and information services can only add to its credibility with the community at large and with the Governor and the Legislature.

PLANNING FOR EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

The Need for New Campuses

The Coordinating Council has the responsibility under the Donahoe Act of determining the need for and location of new campuses in California's three systems of public higher education: the University, the State Colleges, and the Community Colleges. Further, it is the policy of the Legislature ". . . not to authorize or to acquire sites for new institutions of public higher education unless such sites are recommended by the Coordinating Council . . ."

The Council has examined the need for new campuses on a statewide/systemwide basis in two major reports, the first in 1964 and the second in 1968. A third major study was planned to begin this year and to be completed in 1972. However, two separate committees have been established to review the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education: the Select Committee on the Master Plan and the Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan. The final recommendations of these two committees undoubtedly will have an impact on facilities planning in the future. For this reason, the Council requested its staff to delay the proposed study until the committees' recommendations on the need for new campuses have been received and thoroughly analyzed.

Grossmont District Second Campus: In November 1970 the Board of Governors of the Community Colleges requested that the Council approve a second campus for the Grossmont Community College District, located in the San Diego area. Following extensive discussion of the findings of its staff and testimony from a number of area representatives, the Council approved the request for a second campus, subject to "subsequent verification of the district and regional enrollment and capacity data," as requested by Council staff.

At its May 1971 meeting, the Council reaffirmed its approval of the second campus after reviewing new enrollment projections prepared by the Department of Finance that indicated that future enrollments in the Grossmont District would exceed the capacity of its one existing campus.

The Utilization of Educational Facilities

The need for new classrooms and class laboratories is a major factor in determining the cost of financing public higher education. The extent to which existing educational facilities are utilized obviously influences that need, just as it influences the amount of money that will be available for other educational needs.

California traditionally has determined the need for new classrooms and laboratories on the basis of how many students are expected to be enrolled and attending classes between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. (It is assumed that these day-time facilities will accommodate students enrolled in evening programs.) Since at least the late 1940's varying

standards have been set for the utilization of classrooms and class laboratories. In 1960, the Master Plan recommended that: (1) classrooms be utilized 30 hours per week, with class enrollments averaging 60 percent of room capacity; and (2) class laboratories be utilized 20 hours per week, with enrollments averaging 80 percent of room capacity. (These uitlization standards were based on the 45 hours available between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m. in a five-day week.) The Master Plan further recommended that the then-proposed Coordinating Council periodically review these standards in the light of future utilization practices.

In 1966 the Council conducted its first comprehensive review of the facilities available in public higher education and their utilization. As a result, the Council adopted standards that: (1) increased classroom utilization to 34 hours per week, with an average occupancy of 66 percent; and (2) increased utilization of lower division laboratories to 25 hours per week, with an average occupancy of 85 percent. No changes were made in utilization standards for upper division laboratories, but space standards were modified extensively. A follow-up study was recommended for 1967.

That year funds awarded to the Council under the Comprehensive Facilities Planning Grant program were provided to the Community and State Colleges to conduct an inventory of their educational facilities and to establish procedures for annual revisions of the inventories. By June 1969, the initial inventories had been completed. Council staff established an ad hoc committee to provide advice on what data were required for a major utilization study and a subsequent review, and possible revision, of the Council's existing utilization and space standards.

Based on its own experience, Council staff realized that utilization standards based only upon classrooms and laboratories were not sufficient to determine the total facility needs of higher education. An approach was required that would include consideration of other factors: level of instruction, patterns of attendance, geographical location, site limitation, environment, academic programs, scheduling, and campus maturity. The approach would also need to provide for consideration of these factors singly or in combinations with regard to both capital and operating costs.

In February 1970, with the advice of the ad hoc committee, the Council contracted with Mathematica, Inc., of Princeton, New Jersey to develop an analytical instrument that would achieve the desired objectives. The efforts of Mathematica resulted in the Facilities Analysis Model, a computer program designed to consider the various factors singly or in combinations and to determine the utilization rate that would provide an educational program for a given enrollment at minimal total cost (capital cost plus operating cost.) Council and segmental staff are currently engaged in testing and evaluating various applications of the Facilities Analysis Model.

The Legislature, in July 1970, modified the existing utilization standards described above. Assembly Concurrent Resolution 151 directed

that utilization standards be based on classroom use between 8 a.m. and 10 p.m. (rather than 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.) five days per week. This increased the classroom utilization standard to 53 out of a possible 70 hours per week, with an average occupancy of 66 percent. The resolution also directed the Council to evaluate the new classroom standard in conjunction with the utilization study it was conducting; to review the high classroom utilization rates at Long Beach and Fullerton State Colleges and to determine what affect, if any, these rates had on educational quality; and to review the class laboratory standards established by the Council in 1966. The resolution finally requested that the Council submit a report on its findings, with recommendations, to the Legislature by January 1971.

This comprehensive staff report, Inventory and Utilization Study for Public Higher Education, Fall 1969, was presented to the Council at its January meeting this year. The Council approved the report and at its March meeting adopted the following recommendations:

1. Present measures of utilization should be retained for computing existing and new capacity, and

   a. The segments should move toward the classroom utilization standards adopted by the Legislature when feasible and economical.

   b. The segments should continue to use the current utilization standards for undergraduate class laboratories but move toward more intensive utilization through evening operation when feasible and economical.

   c. Existing space standards for classrooms and undergraduate class laboratories should be revised and space standards developed for class laboratories in subject fields without standards and submitted to the Council for approval.

   d. Standards for graduate, individual study, and special class laboratories should be developed and submitted to the Council for approval.

2. All new class laboratories should be planned to accommodate extended day operations.

3. When the Facilities Analysis Model is operational on an individual campus, the information provided by the Model should become the basis for determining the capital outlay requirements and associated utilization rates for that campus.

4. Prior to considering requests for new facilities, the segments and control agencies should require appropriate, current data on utilization.

Because of existing statutory limitations, the Council can only advise that the standards it has adopted be observed. It is now the responsibility of the public segments of higher education to apply these utilization standards in preparing their requests for capital outlay funds and the responsibility of State agencies such as the Department of Finance and Office of the Legislative Analyst to apply them when such requests are reviewed for recommendation to the Legislature.

The Sharing of Educational Facilities

On several occasions in the past it has been suggested that the Coordinating Council undertake a study of the joint use of facilities among public and private institutions of higher education in California. Legislators, governing board members, and others have often expressed the view that the need for building expensive, specialized campus facilities might be reduced, at some savings to taxpayers, if individual institutions could be encouraged to share in the use of such facilities.

A recommendation to this effect was included in the 1968 report of the Governor's Survey on Efficiency and Cost Control, which called upon the Council to:

> Require joint utilization of higher education facilities to avoid unnecessary construction of new colleges and duplication of facilities and personnel.

In response to this widespread interest, the Council in 1970 retained a consultant to undertake an exploratory study of facilities sharing in California higher education. The consultant's report, Facility Sharing Among Institutions of Higher Education in California, was presented to the Council in December of this year.

In summary, the basic findings contained in the report indicated that:

1. "Sharing" is not easily defined because it cannot be limited simply to the joint-use of physical facilities.

2. "Sharing" is difficult to attain and, in fact, is perhaps contrary to those forces that have created and nurtured institutions of higher education.

3. "Sharing" of a substantial magnitude generally occurs only where:

   a. There is no alternative,

   b. The power to require that "sharing" take place exists, or

c. There is a significant quid pro quo for each member of a cooperative partnership.

Because of its exploratory nature, the report provided little basis for decision making by the Council--in fact, more questions were raised than answers provided. However, the report does provide a point of departure if the Council wishes actively to pursue "sharing" as a method or technique for reducing capital outlay costs. Because the Council does not review capital outlay plans on an annual basis, the responsibility for insuring that appropriate facilities sharing occurs must rest with the segments of higher education and those agencies that annually review plans for capital outlay.

FACULTY AFFAIRS

Faculty Salaries and Benefits

Each year since 1963 the Coordinating Council has provided advice to the Governor and the Legislature on the level of faculty salaries and fringe benefits in the California State Colleges and the University of California. Formal responsibility for preparing annual recommendations was not assigned to the Council, however, until 1965, when the Legislature adopted Senate Concurrent Resolution 51.

The aim of the Council's recommendations over the years has been to maintain the competitive position of the State Colleges and the University -- vis a vis institutions of comparable standing throughout the United States -- in the recruitment and retention of the best-qualified faculty.

The procedures used by the Council in preparing its recommendations on salaries and benefits were approved by the Joint Legislative Budget Committee in 1964 and were followed in subsequent years. The form in which the recommendations were presented varied, however, as changes were made in the list of institutions to which the State Colleges and University were compared and in the method of projecting salaries for comparison purposes. The most substantive changes were made in 1969, when a new and simplified procedure developed by the staff was approved by the Council.

In a report presented to the Council in November 1970, the staff reviewed the effect of past Council recommendations on faculty salaries, pointing out the fact that "State appropriations for faculty salaries since 1966 have consistently fallen short of maintaining comparability," even though the Council had followed the procedure established by the Legislature. "Since the present method of determining the level of faculty compensation has been both ineffective and unsatisfactory," the report concluded, "efforts should be made immediately to develop a new rationale and new procedures ...."

The staff's dissatisfaction with the procedures in question had been shared for various reasons and at other times by members of the Council, segmental representatives, the Legislative Analyst, the Department of Finance, and individual legislators and their staffs.

Responding to this general dissatisfaction, the Council directed its staff to reexamine the procedures used in preparing the annual recommendations and to report its findings, conclusions, and any recommendations to the Council prior to the beginning of the next scheduled report on faculty salaries and benefits.

The staff report was presented to the Council at its July 1971 meeting. The report recommended extensive modifications in existing procedures that would require the collection of extensive additional data on comparison institutions and new data on external economic factors.

The Council concluded that various factors, including the time and effort required to gather the data, militated against the use of the proposed new procedures in preparing salary and benefit recommendations for the 1972-73 academic year.

Instead, the Council advised the University and the State Colleges to conduct individual analyses of faculty salary and benefit needs for 1972-73 and to submit their recommendations, together with the data and rationale on which they were based, to the Council by November 1. At the same time, the Council directed its staff to review the segmental analyses and recommendations and report its findings at the December meeting.

In its subsequent report to the Council, the University recommended that: (1) faculty salaries be increased by an overall percentage of 13.1 for 1972-73, and (2) fringe benefits be increased from the current level of 12.1 percent of average salaries to a level of 18 percent. The report submitted by the State Colleges recommended that: (1) faculty salaries be increased by an overall percentage of 13.0 for 1972-73, and (2) fringe benefits be increased from the current level of 10.5 percent of average salaries to a level of 14.5 percent.

It should be remembered that the University and State College faculties received no increase in salaries or benefits in 1970-71 or, again, in 1971-72.

The Council staff's review of the segmental recommendations was presented the following month at the December meeting. The staff suggested that two modifications be made in the University's procedures for determining salaries and benefits. The first was in the statistical procedure used to weight composite average salaries in the comparison institutions and the second was in the projection rate for inflation. Adoption of the proposed modifications would result in an increase in University salaries averaging 9.94 percent (rather than 12.1 percent) and an increase in fringe benefits to a level of 14.3 percent (rather than 18.0 percent).

In regard to the procedures used by the State Colleges, Council staff suggested that new criteria be developed for determining institutional comparability and a new group of comparison institutions be selected for future salary and benefit studies. The staff further proposed that the State Colleges compare average salaries on a rank-by-rank basis and adopt a method for projecting salaries similar to that used by the University. Adoption of the latter two suggestions would result in an increase in State College faculty salaries averaging 11.5 percent (rather than 13.0 percent) and an increase in fringe benefits to a level of 13.4 percent (rather than 14.5 percent).

The Council voted to adopt the increases in faculty salaries and fringe benefits recommended by the University and the State Colleges, with the assumption that any such increases would be approved within the guidelines established by the national Cost of Living Council.

Academic Freedom and Faculty Responsibility

Historically, the issue of academic freedom has been one that generates intense interest and often controversy within and outside of the academic community. With political activism disrupting many of the nation's campuses in the late 1960's and early 1970's, academic freedom was even more at issue. Particularly in question was the appropriateness of faculty members using their position to advocate goals and actions other than those traditionally associated with higher education. There was widespread consensus that the limits of academic freedom must be defined and clarified, and responsible educational bodies and organizations were urged to address themselves to this task.

The issue of academic freedom and faculty responsibility was brought before the Council at its January meeting by the Director. He presented for the members' consideration a statement issued earlier by the American Association of University Professors, which called upon faculties themselves to take the lead in defining academic freedom. The statement declared that "the faculty's responsibility to defend its freedoms cannot be separated from its responsibility to uphold those freedoms by its own actions." The document emphasized that "membership in the academic community imposes.....an obligation to respect the dignity of others, to acknowledge their rights to express differing opinions, and to foster and defend intellectual honesty, freedom of inquiry and instruction, and free expression on and off the campus ...." Consequently, the "free expression of dissent .... may not be carried out in ways which injure individuals or campus institutional facilities or disrupt the classes of one's teachers or colleagues."

Specific action on the part of faculties to supplement their standard disciplinary procedures was called for. Faculties should by their actions assure that they will be consulted in the development of procedures designed to cope with campus disturbances. They should develop procedures other than dismissal, such as warnings and reprimands. Finally, faculties should "assume a more positive role as the guardian of academic values against unjustified assaults from [their] own members."

On the basis of the discussion that resulted, the Council found "that it [was] in general agreement with the sentiments and principles enunciated" in the AAUP statement and commended it to other members of the California educational community for their consideration.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The Coordinating Council has been designated by the Legislature as the State Commission responsible for the administration of four federal programs that provide funds to California institutions of higher education and to community organizations. The programs are:

1. Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.
2. Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965.
3. Title VI-A of the Higher Education Act of 1965.
4. Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964.

Since 1964, California has received more than $187 million in federal funds under these programs. Under Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act, public and private colleges and universities have received some $175 million to aid in the construction of undergraduate facilities--classrooms, laboratories, libraries, etc. Another $8½ million in funds have been provided by Title VI-A for the purchase of instructional equipment, ranging from typewriters to closed-circuit television systems. Almost $4 million have been provided under Title I of the Higher Education Act and Title VIII of the Housing Act to fund programs in community service and continuing education and programs for training in community development.

The Council itself has been the recipient of a federal grant for a program of statewide comprehensive planning of higher education facilities. An initial three-year grant of some $647,000 was awarded to the Council in 1968. The grant was extended in 1970 with an additional $122,796, and again during the current fiscal year with $111,993 in federal funds.

Title I, Higher Education Act of 1965

Communities throughout California are faced with a wide variety of local problems: among others, housing, public transportation, youth opportunities, health care services, employment, and the environment. The purpose of Title I of the Higher Education Act is to make the resources of institutions of higher education available to their local communities in the solution of some of these pressing problems. To that end, Title I grants are awarded to California institutions for the development and implementation of programs of community service and continuing programs are funded on a cost-sharing basis, with at least one-third of the cost provided locally.

At its May 1971 meeting, the Coordinating Council approved the allocation of approximately $460,000 to fund 14 community service programs proposed by both private and public institutions. One consortium project subsequently was modified into four separate projects, although the cooperative aspect of the original proposal was retained.

This marks the sixth year the Council has served as the State Commission for the administration of Title I. During this period, Council staff has reviewed 276 Title I proposals. Of this total, 84 have been selected for funding at a cost of approximately $3 million.

Among the Title I projects funded during 1971, the Council included one designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the Title I program since its inception in 1965. To be conducted by a team of consultants, the evaluation will attempt to identify administrative problems, the objectives of Title I programs at various levels of administration, and the direct and indirect effects of the programs conducted by California institutions of higher education over the past six years. The consultants' final report, which will be completed in April 1972, is expected to provide the basis for a staff review and possible Council revisions to the State Plan, which sets forth the objectives and guidelines for the Title I program in California.

At its May meeting, the Council also approved an amendment to the State Plan for 1971-72. For the past three years, the Plan has focused attention on one major problem area--the quality of life in the ghetto. While continuing this emphasis to a degree, the revised State Plan will devcte major attention to the problems of "organizational development." The goal is to develop in institutions of higher education a commitment to--and the capability for--the organizational changes that they must make within themselves in order to provide truly effective programs in community service and continuing education for those members of the community they now cannot or do not serve.

Title I, Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963

Burgeoning enrollments during the 1960's posed a multitude of problems for colleges and universities throughout the United States. Chief among these was how to provide, in the face of limited financial resources, the physical facilities to accommodate the rapidly increasing student population. Congress responded to this problem by establishing the Title I program in 1963.

Under Title I, institutions of higher education receive federal funds to help them construct needed undergraduate facilities--classrooms and laboratories, among others. The assistance is in the form of federal matching grants that provide up to 50 percent of the eligible project costs. Section 103 of the Title I Act applies to public community colleges and technical institutes, Section 104 to public and private four-year institutions.

As the State Commission that administrates Title I, the Coordinating Council evaluates applications for funds from eligible California institutions and ranks them in priority order. Upon receipt of the Council's recommendations for funding, the U.S. Commissioner of Education awards construction grants directly to the successful applicants.

Title I funds awarded to California colleges and universities since 1964 (the year in which the program was inaugurated) exceed $175 million. This total includes $4,424,720 that will be available during the current fiscal year. Recommendations for the award of these funds will be presented to the Council early in 1972.

Title VI-A, Higher Education Act of 1965

Instructional equipment is a major cost item in the budget of any college or university. The Title VI-A program assists public and private institutions of higher education, and certain postsecondary institutions, as well, in improving their programs of undergraduate instruction by providing matching grants for the purchase of instructional equipment, including closed-circuit television.

For the 1970-71 fiscal year, the Council recommended funding for 61 applications under Category I of the Act (instructional equipment) and 14 applications under Category II (closed-circuit television equipment.) Grants awarded to the 75 applicants totaled $794,436. For the current fiscal year (1971-72), $1,416,862 is available in Title VI-A funds and Council staff recommendations for their allocation will be presented in the spring of 1972.

Since the Council was designated as the State Commission for the administration of Title VI-A in 1965, California has received a total of $8,698,324 under this program.

Title VIII, Housing Act of 1964

Known as the "Community Development Training Program," Title VIII is designed to improve the capabilities of local and state government personnel who work in positions that affect community growth and change. To accomplish this objective, Title VIII grants are used to support training programs in community development for technical and professional personnel who are in or about to enter the field.

As the designated State Commission for the administration of Title VIII in California, the Coordinating Council adopts an annual State Plan that sets forth the objectives of the Title VIII program in priority order and describes each of the projects proposed for funding. The State Plan is then submitted to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for review and approval.

At its March 1971 meeting, the Council adopted a State Plan containing 21 projects requiring $191,236 in Title VIII grants. The Department of Housing and Urban Development approved 17 of the projects and provided $147,000 in federal grant funds. Subsequently, Council staff was advised that additional Title VIII funds were available and a second State Plan was prepared. This second Plan, which requested $193,944 to fund 14 projects, was adopted by the Council at its December meeting. Approval of the plan by HUD is pending.

At the end of the 1971-72 fiscal year, administration of the Title VIII program will be transferred from the Council to another State agency or department. Because Title VIII does not involve higher education in a direct way, the Council has felt for some time that administration of the program should be given to a more appropriate agency. In 1970, the Council adopted a resolution requesting legislation to accomplish this transfer. A bill for this purpose was introduced in the Assembly but did not pass.

Similar legislation was introduced in the 1971 Session and was adopted. Assembly Bill 3048 (Wilson) transfers the administrative responsibilities for Title VIII to the Governor's Office. Announcement of the new agency designated to administer the program is expected early next year.

Comprehensive Facilities Planning Grants

The funds available for the construction of physical facilities in California's three systems of public higher education have diminished steadily in recent years--as has been the case in most other states. If the limited funds available now and in the future are to be used to the best effect, statewide planning for the construction of expensive educational facilities is essential.

In 1966, Title I of the Higher Educational Facilities Act was amended to provide grants to states for the development of comprehensive facilities planning programs. In California this responsibility has been assigned to the Coordinating Council, which since 1966 has received $1,328,547 for comprehensive planning activities.

These grants have enabled the Council and its staff to conduct the first statewide inventory of physical facilities and their utilization in public higher education; to develop a Facilities Analysis Model, a computer program which determines what utilization rate of physical facilities provide the lowest operating and capital costs; and to develop a mathematical model for projecting college and university enrollments as far as 30 years into the future.

While these statewide planning programs have been pursued actively during the past year, major emphasis has been placed on a review of the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education. This restudy is being conducted in the context of the changes that have taken place during the past decade and of the challenges that face California higher education in the years ahead. (The review of the Master Plan, as well as other planning programs, are also discussed elsewhere in this report.)

Planning for facilities cannot be conducted in a vacuum but must be done in conjunction with planning activities that concern student, educational organization and structure, academic programs, faculty and staff, and financing. Due in large part to the efforts of the Council and its staff, the federal government has recognized the importance of these factors in comprehensive planning and has modified its grant program accordingly.

Special Opportunity Planning Grants

In 1969, the U.S. Office of Education established a second grant program for facilities planning. Known as the Special Opportunity Grant Program, it provides funds to institutions of higher education to conduct planning programs for facilities in urban areas, particularly in or near Model Cities.

As the State Commission for this grant program, the Coordinating Council reviews, selects, and recommends applications for funds to the Office of Education, which determines which proposals will be funded. Grant funds are awarded directly to the Council, which distributes them to the applicants and is responsible for preparing progress reports and final program reviews.

Proposals for funding in 1971-72 were presented to the Council at its January meeting. Subsequently, three were recommended for funding; the first for planning a student health facility at San Francisco City College, the second for a coordinated education program and center for the Model Cities area of San Jose, and the third for a neighborhood educational and cultural center in the Model Cities area of San Diego. The Office of Education approved funding for these proposals and provided $165,000 in grants.

Later in January, Council staff was notified that additional grant funds were available for special projects dealing with plans for educational facilities in rural areas. Within a few short weeks, the staff developed a planning proposal on behalf of the eight institutions of public higher education that serve the 13 counties that make up northeastern California. At its March meeting the Council approved the proposal and submitted it to the Office of Education, which subsequently awarded a grant of some $55,000 to the Council.

This grant is being used to conduct an intersegmental regional planning study involving the eight institutions and community representatives from throughout northeastern California. The study's goal is to determine how the educational resources of the area can be utilized more effectively and what decentralized or off-campus facilities are needed to make these resources accessible to the people who live in this vast area. A Steering Committee has been appointed to oversee the study and a Project Director retained to conduct it.

Since 1969, the Council has received over $665,000 in grant funds to carry out the planning activities under this program.

LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS

One of the primary responsibilities assigned to the Coordinating Council by the Donahoe Act is to provide advice to the Governor and the Legislature on matters concerning higher education, both at their request and at the initiative of the Council. Generally, this advice is in the form of recommendations adopted by the Council on the basis of its own studies or of formal and informal testimony presented by the Director and his staff before various legislative committees. The Council also maintains close liaison, through the Director and his Staff, with other State officials and agencies throughout the year, providing data and comments on all aspects of higher education.

During 1971, a number of bills and resolutions were introduced in the Legislature that directly affected the Coordinating Council. Although few of them became law, several are noteworthy.

AB 232 (Dunlap) — Vetoed by the Governor

Appropriated $65,000 to the Council to study the feasibility and desirability of transferring the California Maritime Academy to the State Colleges system.

AB 661 (Cory) — Defeated by the Assembly Education Committee

Abolishes the Council and transferred its responsibilities for the administration of federal programs to the State Scholarship and Loan Commission.

AB 730 (Brathwaite) — Defeated on the Assembly Floor

Required the Director of the Council to take steps to employ a greater number of women on the staff.

AB 1288 (Ryan) — Dropped by the Author

Required the Governor to select a State agency to administer Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964. Dropped by Mr. Ryan at the request of Council staff in favor of AB 3048 (Wilson) which was virtually identical.

AB 2394 (Hayden) — Dropped by the Author

Declared the intent of the Legislature to be that each Community College transfer student be advised of the number of units he had completed that were acceptable for transfer by the University of California or the California State Colleges upon entering one of those institutions.

AB 3001 (Vasconcellos) — Signed by the Governor, Chapter 1264

Staggers the terms of the members of the Council, a feature inadvertently omitted when AB 73 (Veysey) changed the composition of the Council.

AB 3048 (Wilson) — Signed by the Governor, Chapter 1719

Transfers the administrative responsibilities of Title VIII of the Federal Housing Act of 1964 from the Council to the Governor's Office. It will become effective July 1, 1972.

ACR 79 (Greene) — Defeated in the Assembly Education Committee

Requested the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the Coordinating Council, and the California Advisory Council on Vocational and Technical Education to establish conservation field campuses as part of the regular subprofessional program of the Community Colleges.

ACR 166 (Lanterman) — Passed by the Legislature, Resolution Chapter 232

Requested the Council's Select Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education and the Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education to examine certain specific questions, including the size of campuses, the continuing need for traditional campuses as the primary component of the higher education system, the role of the Community Colleges, the need for graduate education, and the establishment of a permanent mechanism for the review of segmental academic plans and programs. In addition, the resolution requested the Council to review periodically high cost programs in higher education.

ACR 174 (Hayden) — Passed by the Legislature, Resolution Chapter 238

Embodies in resolution form the same language relating to notification of acceptable transfer units contained in AB 2394, also by Mr. Hayden.

HR 36 (Bill Greene) — Defeated by the Assembly Education Committee

Requested the Council to develop a list of occupation-centered baccalaureate programs offered at State College campuses.

HR 37 (Bill Greene) — Defeated by the Assembly Education Committee

Requested the Council and the Legislative Analyst to study duplication of course offerings of the extension divisions of the University of California and the California State Colleges vis-a-vis the adult, evening, and regular degree program offerings of private colleges and universities and of the California Community Colleges.

HR 41 (Bill Greene) — Defeated by the Assembly Education Committee

Requested the Council, in cooperation with the State Scholarship and Loan Commission and the California Advisory Council on Vocational Education and Technical Training, to study the extent to which post-secondary programs of California institutions of higher learning have a career-education orientation.

SB 235 (Alquist) — Vetoed by the Governor

Substantially revised the composition of the Council by adding two additional public members and altering the appointing authorities so that the four segments of higher education, the Governor, and the Legislature would each have had four appointments.

SB 1254 (Harmer) — Defeated by the Senate Education Committee

Required the Council to conduct a study to determine the number of units accumulated by students prior to receiving academic degrees and to establish norms governing the maximum number of units allowed to be accumulated towards specified degrees.

SB 1467 (Dymally) — Vetoed by the Governor

Established a "California Commission for the Study of Medical Schools," composed of a number of persons including the Director of the Council, to be funded by "surpluses" in the amount of $250,000 from fees paid to the Board of Medical Examiners.

SB 1478 (Carpenter) — Dropped by the Author

Required the Council to make annual projections of the full cost of instruction for students in each of the three public segments of higher education. Dropped by the author at the request of the segments in favor of a resolution (SCR 105).

SB 1574 (Rodda) — Vetoed by the Governor

Established a Council on Private Postsecondary Education Institutions within the Department of Education to replace the Department's Bureau of School Approvals as the administrator of Division 21 of the Education Code, which deals with the regulation of private postsecondary education in California.

SCA 65 (Stiern) — Dropped by the Author

Constitutional amendment to exempt the staffs of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education from the civil service system.

SCR 105 (Carpenter) — Passed by the Legislature, Resolution Chapter 198

Requested the Council to determine annually the full cost of instruction for students in each of the three segments of public higher education in California.

No report on Legislative activities would be complete without some mention of the deliberations over the Council's 1971-72 budget. The budget was introduced by the Governor substantially as proposed by the Council, approved by the Legislature, and signed with only one change--a reduction of $2,783 recommended by the Legislative Analyst as a workload adjustment in Title I (HEA), the community service and continuing education program.

During legislative review of the budgets for the University of California and the California State Colleges, Council staff provided information and advice as requested by the Assembly Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committees. The information supplied was primarily of a technical nature and was relied upon by these Committees in the formulation of the legislative budget for the segments. Earlier, Council staff had provided similar information to the Department of Finance, which also proved to be helpful.

Mention should also be made of certain other legislation which, while directly concerning one or another of the public segments of higher education, also had implications for the Coordinating Council.

ACR 125 (Vasconcellos) — Defeated in the Senate Education Committee

Requested the Regents of the University and the Trustees of the State Colleges to increase the percentage of allowable special admissions from four percent to six percent. The Senate Education Committee defeated the bill on the grounds that funding was not available for such an effort and that such a change should not be made until the Coordinating Council had been asked for its opinion on the matter.

SCA 32 (Alquist) — Defeated in the Senate Education Committee

Created a single system of higher education under the auspicies of the Board of Regents and authorized the establishment of regional governing bodies to carry out a substantial amount of the administrative functions of all public institutions of higher education within the region. It would also have eliminated all of the ex-officio members of the Board of Regents with the exception of the President of the University. This was the enabling constitutional amendment which would have been necessary to implement the Master Plan that was developed by the staff of the former Joint Legislative Committee on Higher Education at the time Assemblyman Unruh was chairman.

SCR 73 (Harmer) — Passed by the Legislature Resolution Chapter 19

Urges the Regents of the University and the Trustees of the State Colleges to make necessary changes in their respective management data systems to conform to the system being developed by the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems with allowances for deviations when the Regents or the Trustees feel the system is not applicable to the operations of their respective segments.

AB 123 (Barnes) — Signed by the Governor Chapter 1620

Changes the title of the California State Colleges to the California State University and Colleges. Although opposed by the University of California, it was supported by both the Trustees and the Coordinating Council and was finally passed by the Legislature after five years of failure in the Senate. As approved, it requires both the Board of Trustees and the Coordinating Council to approve criteria by which individual State Colleges may have their names changed to include the word "university" and also provides that both boards must approve the specific name changes before they take effect.

AB 705 (Dunlap) — Vetoed by the Governor

Transferred the administration of the California Maritime Academy from its current Board of Governors to the Trustees of the California State Colleges. It was vetoed on the grounds that additional study was needed. The Governor has since established a task force to look into the matter in more depth and has asked the Director of the Coordinating Council to serve on that task force.

AB 1361 (McAlister) — Defeated by the Assembly Education Committee

Appropriated $30.4 million to the Trustees for salary increases for State College faculty. If it had passed, it would have implemented the recommendations of the Coordinating Council for the 1971-72 budget year.

ACR 125 (Vasconcellos) — Defeated in the Senate Education Committee

Requested the Regents of the University and the Trustees of the State Colleges to increase the percentage of allowable special admissions from four percent to six percent. The Senate Education Committee defeated the bill on the grounds that funding was not available for such an effort and that such a change should not be made until the Coordinating Council had been asked for its opinion on the matter.

SB 555 (Alquist) — Defeated in the Senate Education Committee

Implemented the superboard proposed by the former Joint Committee on Higher Education. It would place all of higher education under the Board of Regents, abolish the Coordinating Council, and establish seven regional coordinating boards. It would have become effective on July 1, 1975.

COUNCIL AFFAIRS

Composition of the Council

Legislation introduced and adopted during the 1970 Session resulted in major changes in the composition of the Council at the beginning of the year. Under the provisions of Assembly Bill 73 (Vesey), membership on the Council was reduced from 18 to 10. This was accomplished by providing for one representative -- rather than the former three-- from each of the four segments of California higher education.

AB 73 also provided for an ex-officio, nonvoting observer to be appointed by the State Board of Education.

As in the past, six of the members of the Council represent the general public and are appointed by the Governor, as is the representative of private higher education. Three members of the Council represent public higher education, each appointed by his respective governing board.

The legislation inadvertently failed to provide for staggered terms of appointment of those members appointed by the Governor. This oversight was rectified by the introduction of Assembly Bill 3001 (Vasconcellos), which was adopted by the Legislature during the 1971 Session and signed into law by the Governor in December.

Council Membership

The change in the composition of the Council, as a result of AB 73, required the new appointment of members in January. The Governor chose to re-appoint the five incumbent members representing the general public: Lorenzo N. Hoopes, Charles F. Horne, Patterson N. Hyndman, Kenneth R. Rearwin, and Robert G. Tuck. Elton D. Phillips was appointed as the sixth representative, succeeding Wendell W. Witter, whose term expired in November 1970. Dr. M. Norvel Young, President of Pepperdine University, was appointed as the representative of private higher education, a position which he held on the former Council.

President Charles J. Hitch was appointed by the Board of Regents to represent the University of California, with Regent W. Glenn Campbell as his alternate. The Board of Trustees appointed Chancellor Glenn S. Dumke to represent the California State Colleges, with Trustee E. Guy Warren as his alternate. Chancellor Sidney W. Brossman was appointed by the Board of Governors to represent the California Community Colleges, with Governor Bernard C. Plover as his alternate.

In February, the State Board of Education notified the Council that it had selected Mrs. Jeanette Ritchie as its nonvoting representative. Mrs. Ritchie was succeeded several months later by Mrs. Virla R. Krotz.

In June, the Board of Trustees re-appointed Chancellor Dumke and Mr. Warren to one-year terms on the Council. The Board of Regents re-appointed President Hitch to another one-year term, with Mr. Joseph Moore, Jr., succeeding Dr. Campbell as his alternate. Chancellor

Brossman and Mr. Plover were re-appointed to one-year terms by the Board of Governors in November.

The Council held its annual election of officers at the July meeting. Mr. Charles F. Horne was elected president for 1971-72, succeeding Mr. Kenneth R. Rearwin. Mr. Lorenzo N. Hoopes was elected Vice President, succeeding Mr. Horne.

Council Budget

Support for the activities and programs of the Coordinating Council come from both State and federal funds. State funds provide for the administration of programs for the planning and coordinating of public higher education in California; they also provide the matching funds required under Title I, HEA (community service) and Title VIII (training in community development). Federal funds are used by the Council to meet the personnel, facilities, and equipment costs it incurs in administering the federal programs for which it has been designated the State Commission.

The Council's budget for the 1971-72 fiscal year totals $952,997. The State's share of the budget is $458,000, an increase of approximately 7 percent over the previous fiscal year. The federal share is $513,486, some $8,000 less than the amount received for 1970-71.

There is a substantial decrease in the amount of federal grant funds available to California higher education under programs administered by the Council. Federal grant funds for 1971-72 total $17,426,179, as compared to $25,604,213 for 1970-71. Grants for projects under Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act suffered the most severe cut, dropping from $25,000,000 in 1970-71 to slightly less than $17,000,000 for the current fiscal year.

Coordinating Council
for Higher Education
1971-72 Budget

Program	State Funds	Federal Funds	Total
State Coordination	$423,983	$ --	$423,983
Higher Education Facilities and Equipment	--	130,000	130,000
Community Services and Continuing Education	18,725	37,350	56,075
Comprehensive Planning	--	330,933	330,933
Training in Community Development	15,292	15,203	30,495
GRAND TOTALS	$458,000	$513,486	$971,486

Federal Grant Funds

Higher Education Facilities and Equipment	$16,869,174
Community Services and Continuing Education	460,005
Training in Community Development	147,000
GRAND TOTAL	$17,476,179

COUNCIL OFFICERS

Charles F. Horne President
Lorenzo N. Hoopes Vice President

COUNCIL MEMBERS

REPRESENTING THE GENERAL PUBLIC

Lorenzo N. Hoopes	Oakland
Charles F. Horne	Pomona
Patterson N. Hyndman	La Mesa
Elton D. Phillips	Los Angeles
Kenneth R. Rearwin	San Diego
Robert G. Tuck	San Francisco

REPRESENTING PRIVATE HIGHER EDUCATION

M. Norvel Young Chancellor, Pepperdine University

REPRESENTING PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

Sidney W. Brossman	Chancellor, California Community Colleges
Glenn S. Dumke	Chancellor, California State Colleges
Charles J. Hitch	President, University of California

EX-OFFICIO MEMBER
REPRESENTING STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Virla R. Krotz Orinda

ALTERNATE
REPRESENTATIVES OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

Joseph A. Moore, Jr.	Regent, University of California
Bernard C. Plover	Member, Board of Governors, California Community Colleges
E. Guy Warren	Trustee, California State Colleges

COUNCIL STAFF

The activities and programs of the Coordinating Council are carried out by a professional staff of 17 members, who are assisted by some 13 secretaries and clerical personnel. Approximately one-half of the staff is maintained through federal funds. During the past year, seven new professionals have joined the Council staff.

In January, William L. Storey joined the staff as Assistant Director for Governmental Affairs. A graduate in political science from the University of California at Berkeley, Mr. Storey was formerly Acting Director of Governmental Affairs for the California State Colleges.

In September, the Director of the Council announced the appointment of Dr. Kenneth B. O'Brien as Associate Director of the Council. An educator with broad experience as a teacher, researcher, and administrator, Dr. O'Brien came to the Council from the presidency of Bloomfield College (N.J.). Dr. O'Brien received his A.B., with honors, from San Jose State College. He earned advanced degrees in American history at Stanford University. Dr. O'Brien succeeded Dr. Willard B. Spalding, who retired in April after having served the Council since 1963, as both Director and Associate Director.

The appointment of Dr. Durward Long as Associate Director of the Council for the Select Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education was announced in October. Dr. Long is on a leave of absence from his position of Vice Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin's Center System. He received his B.A. from Troy State College, his M.A. from Auburn University, and his Ph.D. (History) from the University of Florida.

Also joining the professional staff were:

George P. Huff, Research Associate. Dr. Huff received a Ph.D. in Educational Psychology from the University of Southern California. He was formerly Director of the Eastern Regional Educational Center at Ely, Nevada.

Phillip Paris, Research Associate. Mr. Paris holds a master's degree in political science from the University of Southern California. Prior to becoming a member of the staff he was Assistant Professor of Political Science at California Lutheran College.

Purificacion Fontanoza, Research Assistant. Mrs. Fontanoza earned her M.A. in Sociology at Southern Illinois University. Previously, she was a Program Coordinator with the State Filipino-American Coordinating Conference.

Shelton T. Enochs, Administrative Trainee. Mr. Enochs received his B.A. in Political Science from the University of California at Davis. Before joining the staff, he was a counselor for the Davis Family Counseling Project.

In addition to their responsibilities for the programs and projects of the Council, members of the staff participated in numerous other professional activities throughout the year. During 1971 various staff members attended conferences and meetings sponsored by the following State and national organizations: Association of Institutional Research, 1971 Spring Articulation Conference, Association of Executive Directors of Higher Education, Regional Workshop of Title I State Administrators, Kellog-West Conference on the External Degree, California Association for Institutional Research, Association of Executive Officers of the Higher Education Facilities Commissions, and the American Association for Higher Education.

Members of the staff hold membership in many of the professional organizations just named as well as in others, including the President's National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children, California Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, American Association of University Professors, and the Advisory Council of the National Center for Management Information Systems.

As Director of the Council, Dr. Knorr was involved in a variety of professional activities. He served as one of California's Commissioners on the Education Commission of the States and as a member of the Governor's Task Force to consider the future of the California Maritime Academy. He is also a member of the State Construction Program Committee and met with the other members -- the Governor, the State Controller, the State Treasurer, and the Director of Finance -- to issue $30 million in Community College construction program bonds.

Dr. Knorr addressed the Sixth Annual Executive Seminar on California Government on the subject of the characteristics of and current issues in California higher education. He met with officials of the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development of Paris to provide information about California higher education for a large volume on comparative international higher education. California higher education was also the subject of a television interview with Dr. Knorr by a team of educators from Yugoslavia.

Dr. Knorr was appointed to the Board of Governors of the Institute for Technology and Society. The Institute, which is based at Sacramento State College, is devoted to improving the relationships between scientists and technicians and the larger community. It also serves as a sponsoring agency for research leading to technological improvements for the benefit of society, such as the Cutter heart valve.

Adding to the Director's already full schedule was his sponsorship of an intern from the University of Panama in the Ford Foundation Latin American Higher Education Administrative internship program. Dr. Knorr also acted as the Chairman for the Select Committee on the Master Plan for its first two organizational meetings.

STAFF OF THE

COORDINATING COUNCIL
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Professional Staff

Owen Albert Knorr	Director
Kenneth B. O'Brien	Associate Director
William L. Storey	Assistant Director for Governmental Affairs
Russell L. Riese	Chief Higher Education Specialist
Courtland L. Washburn	Chief Higher Education Specialist
Horace F. Crandell	Principal Higher Education Specialist
David A. Duxbury	Principal Higher Education Specialist
James V. de la Vergne	Associate Higher Education Specialist
William K. Haldeman	Associate Higher Education Specialist
Donald G. Ridenour	Editor of Publications
George P. Huff	Research Associate
Purificacion Fontanoza	Research Assistant
John R. Dykes	Administrative Assistant
Mary E. MacDonald	Junior Staff Analyst
Shelton Enochs	Administrative Trainee

M. Durward Long — Associate Director
(for Select Committee on the Master Plan)

Secretarial and Clerical Staff

Corlyss Oates
Marjorie Crapulli
Carol Frank
Patricia McIlravy
Susanna Velasco
Rita Williams
Ruby Davidson
Barbara Rinker
Gladys Stangl
Ana Hartmann
Donna Stephan
William Nolan

COUNCIL REPORTS AND STUDIES ISSUED DURING 1971

71-1 Annual Report of the Director (6/71)

71-2 Inventory and Utilization Study for Public Higher Education (1/71)

71-3 Higher Cost Programs in California Public Higher Education (3/71)

71-4 Guidelines for Increasing Efficiency in Graduate Education (3/71)

71-5 Educational Opportunity Programs in California Higher Education 1969-70 (4/71)

71-6 California State Plan Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Amended May 4, 1971 (5/71)

71-7 Facility Sharing Among Institutions of Higher Education in California (Jerome Evans, Consultant) (7/71)

71-8 Agricultural Programs in California Public Higher Education (George Gries, Consultant) (10/71)

-- Early Childhood Development Programs: Articulation and Coordination (1/71)

-- Title VI-A 1971 State Plan (10/71)

-- Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963. 1971 State Plan (10/71)

-- 1971-72 Title VIII State Plan (3/71)

COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED DURING 1971

Number	Title
382	Adopting Council Special Rules of Order (83) 2-7
383	Appointing Council Representative to the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing (83) 9
384	Approving Proposals for Special Opportunity Grants for 1971-72 Under the Higher Education Facilities Act (83) 11-12
385	Concerning Statement on "Freedom and Responsibility" by the American Association of University Professors (83) 12-13
386	Creating Master Plan Committee (83) 8-9
387	Regarding Annual Report on the Delineation of Functions in California Public Higher Education (83) 13-14
388	Articulation and Coordination of Early Childhood Programs (83) 16-18
389	Transmitting Progress of Council Response to HR 376 (83) 18-19
390	Commending Dr. William C. Bark (83) 21
391	Commending Dr. W. Glenn Campbell (83) 21-22
392	Commending Mr. James C. Dodd (83) 22
393	Commending Mr. William C. Farrer (83) 22-23
394	Commending Mr. George D. Hart (83) 23
395	Commending Mr. Robert A. Hornby (83) 24
396	Commending Mrs. Winifred H. Lancaster (83) 24-25
397	Commending Mr. Joseph A. Moore, Jr. (83) 25
398	Commending Mrs. Carol W. Marsden (83) 25-26
399	Commending Mr. Wendell W. Witter (83) 26
400	Adopting Schedules of Council Meetings for 1971-72 (84) 2

Number	Title
401	Programs in Criminal Justice (84) 3-8
402	Space and Utilization Standards (84) 10-11
403	Higher Cost Programs (84) 12-13
404	Council's Roles in the Review of Academic Plans and Programs (84) 14-19
405	Approving Priority List of Projects for Grants Under Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (84) 20-24
406	Guidelines for Increasing Efficiency in Higher Education (84) 25-33
407	Commending Dr. Willard B. Spalding (84) 34
408	Adopting 1971-72 State Plan for the Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 (84) 35
409	Approving Special Opportunity Grant for Extending Higher Education Services in Northeastern California (84) 36
410	Adopting a Plan for the Organization and Operation of the Master Plan Committee (84) 37-41
411	Legislative Changes on the Master Plan (84) 42
412	Approving Priority List of Projects for Inclusion in the 1971-72 State Plan for Community Development Training (84) 42-46
413	Concerning the Staff Report on the California Maritime Academy (85) 2
414	Allocation of Funds Under Title VI-A of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (85) 16-17
415	Funding of Applications Under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (85) 16-17
416	Approving a Request for a Porposal to Evaluate Title I (HEA 1965) Programs in California, 1966-70 (85) 18
417	Adopting 1971-72 Revised State Plan for Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (85) 19

Number	Title
418	Concerning Educational Opportunity Programs in California Public Higher Education (85) 20-24
419	Approving a Request for Funds for the Site of an Additional Campus in the Grossmont District (85) 25
420	Enabling the Director to Contract for the Management of Administrative Details for the Select Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education (86) 3
421	Approving Proposed Council Budget for 1972-73 (86) 3-7
422	Concerning Preparation of Recommendation on Faculty Salaries and Fringe Benefits for 1972-73 (86) 7-8
423	Commending Kenneth R. Rearwin (86) 8-9
424	Resolution Approving 1971 State Plan for Title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963
425	Approving 1971 State Plan for Title VI-A of HEA of 1965
426	Approving Council Study of Extended Degree Programs
427	Regarding Division 21 of the Education Code
428	Concerning the Development of Procedures and Criteria for Sharing Educational Facilities
429	Faculty Salaries and Fringe Benefits at the University of California - 1972-73
430	Faculty Salaries and Fringe Benefits at the California State Colleges - 1972-73
431	Concerning Relationship between National Guidelines and Faculty Salaries
432	Approving the 1972-73 State Plan for Title VIII of the Housing Act of 1964
433	Concerning the Annual Report of the Delineation of Functions in California Public Higher Education

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

In developing and conducting its studies and long-range planning programs, Council staff utilizes the services of advisory committees composed of members with expertise in the areas under examination or consideration. These committees meet regularly and offer guidance to the staff during the course of the studies and of program development. Council staff is also assisted by advisory committees in the administration of certain federal programs.

The Council also relies on the staffs of both the central and campus administrations of the three public segments of California higher education, for they are in a position to supply information without which many studies could not be concluded. The use of this resource has the effect of multiplying the effectiveness of Council staff and generally results in far more useful and comprehensive documents than would otherwise be possible.

The advisory committees that were active during 1971 are listed on the following pages. The Director wishes to take this opportunity to express his appreciation for the valuable contributions made to the work of the Council by the members of these committees.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Burnham Enersen
McCutchen, Doyle, Brown & Enersen
San Francisco, California

Donald M. Hart
Bakersfield, California

Louis Heilbron
San Francisco, California

Richard A. Hernandez
Los Angeles, California

Ivan Hinderaker
Chancellor
University of California, Riverside
Riverside, California

David D. Hurford
Alhambra, California

Paul Lawrence
Regional Commissioner
U.S. Office of Education
San Francisco, California

Stanley W. Legro
San Diego, California

Thomas McGrath
President
Sonoma State College
Rohnert Park, California

Gordon S. Marshall
Marshall Industries
San Marino, California

Roger C. Pettitt
Los Angeles, California

Joseph Platt
President
Harvey Mudd College
Claremont, California

Carlyle Reed
The Sacramento Union
Sacramento, California

Jeanette Ritchie
Menlo Park, California

Armen Sarafian
President
Pasadena City College
Pasadena, California

Gordon Smith
San Francisco, California

Stephen D. Sugarman
O'Melveny and Myers
Los Angeles, California

SEGMENTAL COMMITTEE
ON
ACADEMIC PLANS AND PROGRAMS

Dr. Gerald Cresci
Assistant Chancellor, Academic and
Student Affairs
California Community Colleges
Sacramento, California

Succeeded by:
Dr. Gus Guichard
Assistant Chancellor, Academic
and Student Affairs
California Community Colleges
Sacramento, California

Dr. Gerhard Friedrich
Dean of Academic Planning
California State Colleges
Los Angeles, California

Dr. Thomas Porter
Academic Assistant to the Vice President,
Academic Affairs
University of California
Berkeley, California

Succeeded by:
Dr. Angus Taylor
Vice President, Academic Affairs
University of California
Berkeley, California

For the Coordinating Council:

Dr. Russell L. Riese
Chief Higher Education Specialist
Coordinating Council for Higher Education
Sacramento, California

AD HOC ADVISORY COMMITTEE
UTILIZATION OF PHYSICAL FACILITIES

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Robert Walen
University Educational Facility Planner
University of California
Berkeley, California

Donovan Smith
Office of Vice President
Planning and Analysis
University of California
Berkeley, California

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

Harry Harmon
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Physical Planning and Development
California State Colleges
Los Angeles, California

Leon Thomas
Associate Dean of Instruction
California State Colleges
Los Angeles, California

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

John Carhart
Contra Costa Junior College District
Martinez, California

Edward Rodgers
Chief, College Facilities Planning
Board of Governors
Sacramento, California

Stuart White
Superintendent
State Center Junior College District
Fresno, California

PRIVATE COLLEGES

Victor Elconin
President
West Coast University
Los Angeles, California

Harry X. Ford
President
California College of Arts and Craf
Oakland, California

Lawrence W. Larson
Vice President and Treasurer
Mills College
Oakland, California

ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON
TITLE I, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Dr. Richard Barbera
Coordinator, Continuing Education
California State Colleges
Los Angeles, California

Mr. Truman V. Berg
Executive Secretary
California Manpower Coordinating Committee
Sacramento, California

Mr. George B. Coover
Manager - Western Region
Educational Relations and Recruiting
General Electric Company
San Francisco, California

Mrs. Claire Courtney
Eureka, California

Dr. Gerald D. Cresci
Dean of Extended Opportunity Programs
California Community Colleges
Sacramento, California

Dr. David P. Gardner
Vice President, Public Service Programs - University Dean of University Extension
University of California
Berkeley, California

Succeeded by:
Mr. Keith R. Sexton
Assistant Dean of University Extension
University of California
Berkeley, California

Dr. Paul Hadley
Dean of Summer Sessions and University College
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

Mr. Brownlee Haydon
Assistant to the President
The Rand Corporation
Santa Monica, California

Mr. Lane Krist
Consultant, Assembly Education Committee
Sacramento, California

Dr. James Loper
President and General Manager
KCET Channel 28
Los Angeles, California

Mr. Manuel T. Mendez
American Institute of Architects
Anaheim, California

Dr. Ernest B. O'Byrne
Vice President, State Commission on Continuing Education
San Diego State College
San Diego, California

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON
TITLE I, HIGHER EDUCATION FACILITIES ACT

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. Robert J. Evans
Assistant Vice President
Physical Planning and Construction
Berkeley, California

Mr. Robert V. Walen
University Educational Facility Planner
Berkeley, California

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

Mr. D. Dale Hanner
Vice Chancellor--Business Affairs
Los Angeles, California

Mr. Harry Harmon
Vice Chancellor--Facilities Planning
and Development
Los Angeles, California

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Dr. Archie McPherran
Assistant Chancellor--Fiscal Affairs
Board of Governors
Sacramento, California

Mr. Edward Rodgers
Chief, College Facilities Planning
Board of Governors
Sacramento, California

Mr. George Young
Coordinator Educational Development
Los Angeles Junior College District
Los Angeles, California

Mr. Boyd Shafsky
Administrative Assistant, Development
Peralta Junior College District
Oakland, California

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

Mr. Lowell Gano
Principal, Higher Education
Department of Finance
Sacramento, California

Mr. Russell Thompson
Department of Finance
Sacramento, California

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

Mr. Harold Geiogue
Administrative Analyst
Legislative Budget Committee
Sacramento, California

Mr. N. B. Keller
Principal Administrative Analyst
Legislative Budget Committee
Sacramento, California

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON
TITLE VI-A, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Dr. Robert J. Evans
Assistant Vice President Physical
Planning and Construction
Berkeley, California

Dr. Angus E. Taylor
Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of California
Berkeley, California

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

Dr. Edward Neuner
Deputy State College Dean for
Instructional Resources
Los Angeles, California

Mr. Harry Harmon
Vice Chancellor Facilities Planning
and Development
Los Angeles, California

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Mr. Edward Rodgers
Chief, College Facilities Planning
Board of Governors
Sacramento, California

Mr. Harlan C. Stamm
Dean for Academic Programs
Board of Governors
Sacramento, California

Dr. Norman E. Watson
Superintendent
Coast Community College District
Costa Mesa, California

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON TITLE VIII

Mr. Lee Baldwin
Assistant Chancellor
Occupational Education
California Community Colleges
Sacramento, California

Dr. Richard C. Barbera
Coordinator of Continuing Education
California State Colleges
Los Angeles, California

Mr. Donald F. Crow
Administrative Assistant
Department of Housing and
Community Development
Sacramento, California

Dr. Randy H. Hamilton, CHAIRMAN
Executive Director
Institute for Local Self Government
Berkeley, California

Mr. Arsen Marsoobian
Manpower Coordinator
League of California Cities
Fresno, California

Dr. Morgan Odell
Executive Director
Association of Independent California
Colleges & Universities
Los Angeles, California

Mr. Michael Poggenburg
Executive Director
Advisory Coordinating Council
State Personnel Board
Sacramento, California

Mr. Keith Sexton
Assistant University Dean
University of California
Berkeley, California

Mr. Tom Van Horne
Research Analyst
County Supervisors Association
Sacramento, California

<u>For the Coordinating Council</u>:

Mr. Shelton Enochs
Staff Assistant

Dr. Kenneth O'Brien
Associate Director

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON
OPTIMIZING THE USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL SPACE

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Donovan E. Smith
Office of Vice President
Planning and Analysis
University of California
Berkeley, California

George B. Weathersby
Assistant Director
Office of Analytical Studies
University of California
Berkeley, California

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

James Farmer
Director, Information Systems
California State Colleges
Los Angeles, California

Harry Harmon
Vice Chancellor
Physical Planning and Development
California State Colleges
Los Angeles, California

Leon L. Thomas
Associate Dean of Instruction
California State Colleges
Los Angeles, California

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

James W. Keene
San Joaquin Delta College
Stockton, California

M. Charles McIntyre
Board of Governors
California Community Colleges
Sacramento, California

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

Russell Thompson
Senior Construction Analyst
Department of Finance
Sacramento, California

Al M. Loeb
Program Budget Analyst
Department of Finance
Sacramento, California

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST

Clinton M. Jordan
Principal Administrative Analyst
Legislative Budget Committee
Sacramento, California

Harold E. Geiogue
Legislative Budget Committee
Sacramento, California

WICHE

Dennis P. Jones
Staff Analyst for Planning & Programming
WICHE
Boulder, Colorado

COORDINATING COUNCIL
JOINT GRADUATE BOARD

	Term	Expires
Father James Albertson Vice President Academic Affairs University of Santa Clara Santa Clara, California	1 year	12/31/71
Mr. Donald M. Castleberry Dean, Graduate Division and Professor of Political Science San Francisco State College San Francisco, California	2 years	12/31/72
Dr. Gerhard Friedrich Dean of Academic Planning California State Colleges Los Angeles, California	3 years	12/31/73
Dr. Miles D. McCarthy Dean, School of Letters, Arts & Sciences and Professor of Biology California State College, Fullerton Fullerton, California	Alternate 1 year	12/31/71
Dr. Charles G. Mayo Dean, Graduate School University of Southern California Los Angeles, California	Alternate 1 year	12/31/71
Dr. Lincoln Moses, CHAIRMAN Dean of Graduate Division Stanford University Stanford, California	2 years	12/31/72
Dr. Anthony Moye Dean of Academic Planning and Professor of Chemistry California State College, Los Angeles Los Angeles, California	1 year	12/31/71
Dr. Philip M. Rice Dean, Claremont Graduate School Claremont University Center Claremont, California	3 years	12/31/73

<u>For the Coordinating Council</u>:

Dr. Russell L. Riese
Chief Higher Education Specialist
Coordinating Council for Higher Education
Sacramento, California

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON
SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 105
(Full Costs of Instruction)

Mr. Mason Anderson
Department of Finance
Sacramento, California

Mr. Roger M. Emanuel
Manager, Models & Simulation
University of California
Berkeley, California

Mr. James Farmer
Director, Information Systems
California State Colleges
Los Angeles, California

Mr. Loren Furtado
Assistant Vice President, Planning
University of California
Berkeley, California

Mr. Lowell R. Gano
Department of Finance
Sacramento, California

Mr. Dale Hanner
Vice Chancellor, Business
California State Colleges
Los Angeles, California

Mr. Boyd W. Horne
Supervisor, Budget Analysis
California State Colleges
Los Angeles, California

Mr. Peter Jegers
Senior Budget Analyst
University of California
Berkeley, California

Mr. Robert La Liberte
Department of Finance
Sacramento, California

Mr. M. Charles McIntyre
Chief, College Financial Service
California Community Colleges
Sacramento, California

Mr. Virgil Whiteley
Department of Finance
Sacramento, California

For the Coordinating Council:

Mr. David A. Duxbury
Principal Higher Education Specialist

Dr. George P. Huff
Research Associate

Mr. William L. Storey
Assistant Director for Governmental Affairs

Dr. Courtland L. Washburn
Chief Higher Education Specialist

ADVISORY COMMITTEE
ON
RESEARCH AND INSTRUCTION IN AGRICULTURE

Dr. John J. Baird
Associate Dean of Academic Planning
California State Colleges
Los Angeles, California

Dr. O. J. Burger
Dean, School of Agriculture
Fresno State College
Fresno, California

Mr. William I. DuBois
Sacramento, California

Mr. Robert Emerson
Senior Vice President
Bank of America
Madera, California

Mr. Eyvind M. Faye
Faye Properties, Inc.
El Dorado Ranch
Knights Landing, California

Dr. J. Cordner Gibson
Dean, School of Agriculture
California State Polytechnic College
San Luis Obispo, California

Mr. Byron Harrison
Director of Agricultural Programs
West Hills College
Coalinga, California

Mr. Richard Johnsen, Jr.
Executive Vice President
Agricultural Council of California
Sacramento, California

Dr. James B. Kendrick, Jr.
Vice President--Agricultural Sciences
University of California
Berkeley, California

Mr. Ugo P. Lea
Chairman, Dept. of Agriculture
Modesto Junior College
Modesto, California

Dr. G. F. MacLeod
Professor of Entomology
University of California
Berkeley, California

Mr. Ralph E. Matthews
Consultant in Agricultural Education
California Community Colleges
Sacramento, California

Dr. Chester O. McCorkle
Executive Vice President
of the University
University of California
Berkeley, California

Dr. D. F. McMillen
Agricultural Economics
Sunkist Growers, Inc.
Van Nuys, California

Mr. William B. Staiger
Executive Secretary
California Cattlemen's Association
Sacramento, California

Mr. Loren Voth
Wasco, California

Consultant:

Dr. George A. Gries
Stillwater, Oklahoma

For the Coordinating Council:

Dr. Russell L. Riese
Chief Higher Education Specialist
Coordinating Council for
Higher Education
Sacramento, California